

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, and 13-15 were rejected. Claims 1-2, 7-9, and 14-15 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Maggenti, Sarkinen, and Neumann. Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Maggenti, Sarkinen, Neumann, and Wu. Objection was further made to claims 6 and 13 for being in improper form and for citing informalities with respect to the recitations of acronyms and the recitations in claims dependent upon claim 1 for recitation of indefinite articles rather than definite articles.

In the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8, the Examiner relied upon Maggenti and Sarkinen for showing the recited method but acknowledged that neither of these two references teach the optional sending of a response message receivable. The Examiner, however, relied upon Neumann for showing a method for setting up or updating a device that includes a message contained in the cell identifier, which clears, deletes an old entry and stores a new entry. The Examiner asserted that it would be obvious to modify the Maggenti/Sarkinen disclosure with the method of Neumann.

The rejection of the claims under this combination of references is respectfully traversed for reasons which follow. Maggenti appears to relate to point to multipoint or multicast procedures in CDMA and is directed to a way in which a communication manager (CM) manages distribution between multiple user equipment communication devices (CD) and a CDMA system. (See, e.g., paragraphs 12-14 and 32.)

Paragraphs 47, 48, and 335-347 of Maggenti disclose that a CD comprises a number of a net- or multi-cast group and requests transmission privileges from the CM, which is granted if no other member currently has transmission privileges, allowing avoidance collision.

In contrast to the invention recited in claims 1 and 8, Maggenti fails to disclose the receiving of a message at the UE that indicates that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state.

While the Examiner relies upon paragraph 6 of Maggenti, paragraph 6 merely mentions that, in some prior systems, a push-to-talk button allows sole access to a dedicated transmission channel.

The disclosure in paragraph 6 merely mentions the existence of a dedicated channel is some instances. And, there does not appear to be disclosure elsewhere in Maggenti of receiving such a message at the UE. Paragraphs 157-168 describe control signaling but make no mention of receiving such a message at the UE.

There is simply no disclosure of receiving a message at a UE indicating that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state.

Maggenti also fails to make disclosure of the message being a cell update confirm message, a URA, an update confirm message, or an RRA setup message. Maggenti wholly fails to disclose the receiving of any such message let alone the indicated, specific type of messaging.

Maggenti further fails to make disclosure, in response to a message that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state of a step of clearing from the UE of any record of a “cell identifier”. Maggenti makes no disclosure of a UE taking any steps whatsoever in this respect. Disclosure of

control signaling in Maggenti is merely related to signaling protocols in the form in which the messages are encoded.

Further, Maggenti fails to make disclosure of optionally sending a response message to the network from the UE after the UE has cleared any record of the cell identifier. While the Examiner acknowledged that Maggenti fails to disclose this operation, Maggenti further fails to disclose the additional features above-iterated.

Maggenti, in essence, discloses nothing more than that a user equipment and a network may exchange messages. Maggenti makes no disclosure of the remaining features of the independent claims and provides no disclosure whatsoever of the advantages that are attained by virtue of the cited features, and in particular, of ensuring that a UE does not carry information that could prevent distinguishing between different user equipment in a cell.

The second-cited reference, Sarkinen, appears to relate to multicast location management including a series of steps performed at a network, and not at a UE. Paragraph 3, for instance, of Sarkinen, describes messages related to the keeping track of UE users in a network, e.g., within a cell (see, e.g., paragraph 8) based upon updates sent by the UE if the cell changes (see, e.g., paragraphs 12 and 51). The UE location information is stored in a multicast location database, MuLD, (see, e.g., paragraphs 37-43). The MuLD is, however, stored at the network, not at a UE, and multiple MuLDs are stored at a central location. Paragraph 7 of Sarkinen refers to the MuLD in each multicast capable of RNC, and paragraphs 76-77 relate to clearing information from the multicast database in the RNC or network.

In contrast to the recitations of the claims of the invention, Sarkinen fails to disclose the receiving of a message at the UE that indicates that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state. While Sarkinen discusses various message protocols, Sarkinen fails to disclose this reception of the cited message.

Further, Sarkinen fails to disclose a message that is one of a cell update confirm message, a URA confirm message, or an RNC confirm message.

Sarkinen further fails to disclose the clearing from the URA any record of a cell identifier in response to the message. Not only does Sarkinen fail to disclose the clearing of cell identifiers from the UE, the clearing of the record is not in response to a message indicating that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state but in response to a UE multicast area update message (see paragraph 77).

Sarkinen therefore fails to disclose various of the advantages achieved in the recited claims of the present invention. Namely, Sarkinen fails to allow changes to take place at the UE such that the UEs within a cell can be distinguished. Additionally, therefore, Sarkinen cannot be combined with Maggenti to provide a method of processing messages between user equipment and a network in which the network performs various steps, contrary to the recitations of the independent claims of the present invention.

Neumann was cited for showing the optionally sending of a response message to the network from the UE after the UE is cleared of any record of a cell identifier.

Neumann appears to relate to a base station of multiple terminals (see, e.g. column 1, lines 26-33). The information as to which base stations are paging appears to be difficult to

derive (see, e.g., column 1, lines 37-40). Hence, Neumann relates to the informing of a service node about base stations involved in paging.

The sections relied upon by the Examiner, column 1, line 55 - column 2, line 2, pertains to information passing between a base station and a GPRS service node. This information passage does not in any way relate to response messages to a network from a UE. Additional passages relied upon by the Examiner relate to the exchange of information within the network rather than between a UE and a network. The section extending between column 5, line 3 – column 6, line 67 refers to the surge of information in an IET or an allocating means (see, e.g., column 5, lines 23, 40, 47, and so forth). Column 3, line 6 – column 4, line 45 indicate that these are all aspects of the GPRS service node rather than a UE. And, the passage at column 7, lines 45-67 relates to multiplication of an MFA or allocating means at a GPRS service node. Claim 1 of Neumann appears to be related to the same component as can be understood in the context of, for example, claims 3 and 4.

Therefore, Neumann also fails to disclose the features recited in the independent claims of the invention and, therefore, in light of the foregoing illuminated deficiencies of Maggenti and Sarkinen, can also not be combined with these other references to create the recited invention.

The additional reference, Wu, cited against claims 4 and 11 in combination with Maggenti, Sarkinen, and Neumann, was cited merely for showing a temporary identifier, C_RNTI. This reference was not cited for showing, and does not appear to show the methodology and structure recited in the independent claims.

Application No. 10/673,810
Amendment dated November 1, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2007

The remaining ones of the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims. These claims are therefore believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited combinations of references for the same reasons as those given with respect to claims 1 and 8.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, independent claims 1 and 8 and the remaining ones of the dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com